UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,631	10/15/2003	Alain Franciosa	A3358Q-US-NP XERZ 2 2630 01374	
	7590 10/31/200 / XEROX - ROCHES	EXAMINER		
1100 SUPERIOR AVE.			SAEED, USMAAN	
SUITE 700 CLEVELAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/605,631	FRANCIOSA ET AL.
Examiner-initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	USMAAN SAEED	2166
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>Usmaan Saeed (PTO)</u> .	(3)	
(2) Kevin M, Dunn (Reg No. 52,842).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 28 October 2008	Time: <u>11:55am</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: 17 and 11		
Prior art documents discussed: None		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENEF See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A telephone call was made to applicant's representative to correct renumbered claim 13 (original claim 17) which depends on cancelled claim 16. Applicant's representative authorized the examiner to correct this error to make renumbered claim 13 (original claim 17) dependent on renumbered claim 9 (original claim 11).